

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending, with Claims 11-20 amended by the present amendment.

In the Official Action, Claims 11-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101; and Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Natarajan et al. (U.S. Patent 6,505,244, hereinafter Natarajan), Evans (U.S. Patent 5,694,524) and Yates et al. (U.S. Patent 6,330,586, hereinafter Yates).

Claims 11-20 are amended as suggested in the Official Action so as to overcome the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101. No new matter is added.

Briefly recapitulating, Claim 1 is directed to a method for modeling video teleconferencing network reliability. The method includes obtaining historical data for multiple video conferences, and storing the historical data in a call history table (e.g., item 102 in Figure 3). The historical data is referenced to video teleconferencing equipment vendor or model identification information (e.g., specification, page 7, line 30 – page 8, line 22; Figures 3-5). The method also includes executing a modeling algorithm (e.g., item 101 in Figure 6; specification, page 9, lines 1-7) that produces a model representing the historical data, analyzing the model to identify characteristics associated with undesirable outcomes for the video conferences (e.g., specification, page 9, line 16 – page 10, line 2), and configuring a video teleconferencing network to avoid at least one of the identified characteristics associated with undesirable outcomes (e.g., specification, page 10, line 15 – page 11, line 6). Independent Claims 11 and 20 are directed to a corresponding computer program product and data processing system.

The first issue is whether Natarajan or Yates discloses or suggests Appellants' historical data referenced to video teleconferencing equipment vendor or model identification information (e.g., specification, page 7, line 30 – page 8, line 22; Figures 3-5).

The second issue is whether Natarajan discloses or suggests Appellants' obtaining historical data for multiple video conferences, and storing this multi-conference historical data in a call history table.

The third issue is whether Natarajan discloses or suggests Appellants' steps of executing a modeling algorithm (e.g., item 101 in Figure 6; specification, page 9, lines 1-7) that produces a model representing the historical data, analyzing the model, and configuring a video teleconferencing network based on the analysis.

Natarajan describes a feedback-based adaptive network wherein at least a portion of the network elements report operating information relating to network conditions to a centralized data store. The information which is reported to the data store is analyzed by a policy engine which includes a plurality of application specific plug-in policies for analyzing selected information from the data store and for computing updated control information based upon the analysis of the information. The updated control information is fed back to selected network elements to thereby affect operation of the selected elements.

Natarajan does not disclose or suggest Appellants' call history table or Appellants' steps of executing a modeling algorithm that produces a model representing the historical data, analyzing the model, and configuring a video teleconferencing network based on the analysis.

- A. Both Natarajan and Yates do not disclose or suggest Appellants' historical data referenced to video teleconferencing equipment vendor or model identification information.

As acknowledged in the Official Action,<sup>1</sup> Natarajan does not disclose or suggest Appellants' historical data referenced to video teleconferencing equipment vendor or model identification information. To cure this deficiency, the Official Action points to Yates,<sup>2</sup> column 5, line 66 – column 6, line 12. However, this passage of Yates merely amplifies an earlier discussion of benefits (not data) associated with various disclosed object-oriented software modules and states “Other potential benefits of the access arrangements for an individual user might include the following: *single contact point for services from different vendors; easy invocation and use of services from different vendors; consistent presentation of services across different vendors; integrated accounting and charging for a service set supplied by multiple vendors*; security from unauthorised invocation and use of services; privacy from unauthorised access to service usage and service content information.” This statement of benefits is not “historical data referenced to video teleconferencing equipment vendor or model identification information,” let alone Appellants' historical data stored in a call history table or Appellants' model representing the historical data. That is, these enumerated benefits are not data at all.

Furthermore, the objects discussed in Yates serve to hide vendor specific features and anomalies, rather than to store and model vendor specific features. That is, Yates' recitation of vendor-related user/system benefits (i.e., 1) single contact point for services from different vendors; 2) easy invocation and use of services from different vendors; 3) consistent presentation of services across different vendors; and 4) integrated accounting and charging for a service set supplied by multiple vendors) are benefits only because any vendor specific

---

<sup>1</sup> Official Action, paragraph 3a.

<sup>2</sup> Official Action, paragraph 3b.

data is hidden or harmonized with a generic model. Nothing about the objects of Yates suggest storing or modeling vendor specific features.

- B. Natarajan does not disclose or suggest Appellants' obtaining historical data for multiple video conferences, and storing this multi-conference historical data in a call history table.

The Official Action refers to Figure 15 of Natarajan for a disclosure of Appellants' storing this multi-conference historical data in a call history table.<sup>3</sup> This figure shows an example of a flow diagram for a data store event handler reporting procedure 1500. Procedure 1500 may be implemented via the event handling entity 272 residing at data store 252. One responsibility of event handler 272 is to continually monitor the data store for new or updated control information which has been generated by the network elements or by the policy engine 254. When event handler 272 detects the occurrence or availability of a new control parameter, it notifies the event server 270 which distributes the event notification message onto the appropriate network element(s).<sup>4</sup> Thus, data store 252 stores data relative to events used by or relating to event handler 272. However, this event data is not Appellants' historical data for *multiple* video conferences. That is, the event data of Natarajan has no persistence from one process to another. Said differently, the event data of Natarajan pertains to a single video teleconference, not to multiple video teleconferences as required by Appellants' claims.

To understand this point, it is first necessary to identify what constitutes event data in Natarajan. While the word "event" is used 247 times in Natarajan, the term 'event' is never explicitly defined. However, an implied definition may be derived from the following examples of events disclosed in Natarajan:

- ...notification for specified events, such as, for example, the availability of updated control information at data store 252.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Official Action, paragraph 3a.

<sup>4</sup> Natarajan, column 25, lines 27-55.

<sup>5</sup> Natarajan, column 10, lines 21-25.

- Yet another purpose of the event handler is to monitor specified network elements, and report the detection of specified events (e.g. detected errors) to event server 270. In an alternate embodiment, the event handler is statically pre-configured so that when it is initialized, it automatically monitors a specified network element for specific types of events and reports detected events to event server 270. For example, when an error is detected by network element 204A, the event handler 274A will report the error to event server 270 to be forwarded to other network and/or control elements (e.g. policy engine 254), which may be interested in this type of information.<sup>6</sup>
- Event handler 272 continually monitors the data store for updated control information and other events.<sup>7</sup>
- The policy engine may either repeatedly poll the data store for updated network data, or rely on an event service to be notified that a change in the network conditions has occurred.<sup>8</sup>
- The application specific policy may be automatically loaded upon on initialization of the policy analysis procedure, or may be loaded subsequently upon the occurrence of an event, such as, for example, the execution of a specific user application.<sup>9</sup>
- The event handler 274A may initially consult a local configuration file (not shown) in order to determine which events the network element is to register for at the event server 270.<sup>10</sup>

However, none of these events are related to **multiple** video teleconferences as required by Appellants' claims. That is, there is no indication that an error of one process (e.g., conference) to be used in another process (e.g., conference). There also is no rationale for an error of one process (e.g., conference) to be used in another process (e.g., conference). Similarly, there is indication that any of the other examples of events described in Natarajan arising in a first process (e.g., conference) would be applicable to a second process (e.g., conference).

The Official Action also cites to column 7, lines 12-43 of Natarajan for a disclosure of Appellants' claimed storing of historical data of **multiple** conferences in a call history table. Appellants traverse this finding and note that the cited passage of Natarajan recites:

"The feedback-based adaptive network of the present invention utilizes a technique wherein at least a portion of the network elements (e.g., 204A,

<sup>6</sup> Natarajan, column 10, lines 41-57.

<sup>7</sup> Natarajan, column 10, line 67 – column 11, line 1.

<sup>8</sup> Natarajan, column 13, line 66 – column 14, line 2.

<sup>9</sup> Natarajan, column 15, lines 42-46.

<sup>10</sup> Natarajan, column 19, lines 25-28.

204B, 208A, 208B, etc.) report network information relating to network conditions to a centralized data storage entity (e.g., data store 252). The reported data corresponds to information relating to the current condition or status of each of the reporting network elements in the network. The information which is reported to the data store 252 is analyzed by a policy engine 254. The policy engine 254 includes a plurality of application specific plug-in policies for analyzing application specific information from the data store and for computing updated control information based upon the analysis of the information. The updated control information may include any type of information, parameters, and/or actions which may be used to affect the operation of one or more network elements. The updated control information is then fed back to selected network elements to thereby affect operation of the selected elements and/or network. Typically, when the operation of a network element has been affected, its corresponding operating parameters and/or operating information will change. The changed operating parameters are then reported to the data store 252 and analyzed by the policy engine 254. The policy engine may then generate new or updated control information or parameters for affecting the operation of selected elements in the network. In this way, the network of FIG. 2 is configured to adapt to changing conditions in the network by providing a dynamic feedback mechanism. Using this dynamic feedback mechanism, selected network elements may be dynamically and automatically reconfigured to cause the performance of various aspects of the network to conform with desired performance criteria.”

Appellants first submit that the above-cited passage of Natarajan discloses nothing related to call history or a call history table. The only data apparently stored in this passage is “changed operating parameters are then reported to the data store 252.” However, neither the recited changed operating parameters nor any other information (e.g., the control information and parameter information analyzed by the policy engine 254) is call history data, let alone call history data of **multiple** video conferences.

First, as with the previous discussion of ‘events’, there is no indication that “current conditions” of equipment involved in one process (e.g., conference) are used in another process (e.g., conference). There also is no rationale for “current conditions” of equipment involved one process (e.g., conference) to be used in another process (e.g., conference). The process, events and models of Natarajan are directed exclusively to single video teleconferences, and not to management of multiple video teleconferences via use of historical data.

Indeed, the only reference to a video teleconference in Natarajan is found relative to the example of Figures 16-18 (“Using the network illustrated in FIG. 16, various aspects of the present invention will now be described by way of example in which a video teleconference is established between user1 (1602) and user2 (1620). The video teleconference example is described in greater detail with respect to FIGS. 17 and 18 of the drawings.”).<sup>11</sup> A review of the entirety of column 29, line 36 – column 33, line 62 reveal that the events monitored relate to a *single* video teleconference, not to multiple video teleconferences as required by Appellants’ independent claims. Thus, at best, Natarajan discloses the storing of historical (event) data relative to the management of a single ongoing video teleconference. Natarajan does not disclose or suggest storing historical (event) data from one video teleconference to be used in a second video teleconference, as required by Appellants’ citation of “multiple conferences.”

- C. Natarajan does not disclose or suggest Appellants’ steps of executing a modeling algorithm that produces a model representing the historical data, analyzing said model, and configuring a video teleconferencing network based on said analysis.

The passages cited in the Official Action relative to Appellants’ modeling refer to the previously discussed Figures 16-18 of Natarajan.<sup>12</sup> These figures provide an illustrative example of how various network elements interact with each other to form a feedback-based adaptive network. In particular, Figure 17 shows a flow diagram of how the feedback-based network of Figure 16 adapts to changing conditions in the network as a video teleconference is initiated between user 1 and user 2. A video teleconference application between user 1 and user 2 is one example of a user application which may require additional bandwidth in order to provide a satisfactory level quality for using the application to service multiple users across the network. Thus, the video teleconference example may be abstracted to be applied to any user application requiring additional network resources to provide a satisfactory level of

---

<sup>11</sup> Natarajan, column 29, lines 53-58.

<sup>12</sup> Official Action, paragraph 3a.

quality for the application to run over a network environment. When a video teleconference begins between users 1 and 2, the network may respond by initiating *one or more bandwidth policies* at the policy engine 1654 and may also respond by initiating one or more policies/procedures at the monitor system 1662.<sup>13</sup>

At 1704 the frame relay CIR policy is initiated at the policy engine 1654 if this policy has not already been initiated. While the frame relay CIR policy is being initiated by the policy engine at 1704, a CIR policy monitor procedure is concurrently initiated (1716) at monitor system 1662, if this procedure has not already been initiated. At 1706, each of the links a, b, c, d of Figure 16 reports the number of packets dropped on that link to data storage 1652. The frame relay CIR policy at the policy engine 1654 uses this data to generate (1708) updated CIR parameter values for each of the respective links. The updated CIR parameter values generated by the policy engine are then written (1710) into the data store 1652. Once the appropriate network elements have been notified of changed network conditions, each of the network elements may retrieve a respective updated CIR parameter information from the data store 1652 and then update its configuration using the updated CIR parameter information.<sup>14</sup>

In the CIR policy monitor procedure of FIG. 17, the quality monitor system 1662 (FIG. 16) may concurrently and continuously monitor the effectiveness of the frame relay CIR policy implemented by the policy engine. In the example of FIG. 17, the effectiveness of the frame relay CIR policy is measured by analyzing the number of packets dropped at each of the respective links A, B, C, D, and comparing this data to predetermined criteria or guidelines. Thus, for example, at 1718, the reported number of packets dropped for links A, B, C, D are analyzed and compared to a predetermined threshold in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the frame relay CIR policy implemented by the policy engine. A

---

<sup>13</sup> Natarajan, column 29, line 36 through column 30, line 66.

<sup>14</sup> Id.



determination is then made (1720) as to whether the frame relay CIR policy is effective in maintaining the number of dropped packets on each or any of the respective links below the predetermined threshold value. If it is determined that the current frame relay CIR policy is effective in maintaining the number of dropped packets on each of the respective links below a predetermined threshold, the quality monitor system 1662 may wait (1722) a specified time interval (e.g., 0-30 minutes) before re-evaluating the effectiveness of the current frame relay CIR policy by analyzing newly updated information relating to the number of packets dropped at each of the respective links.<sup>15</sup>

However, contrary to the Official Action, none of the data monitoring and analysis of these, or any other, passage of Natarajan relates to Appellants claimed executing a modeling algorithm that produces a model *representing the historical data*, analyzing said model, and *configuring a video conferencing network* based on said analysis. That is, for the reasons previously presented, Natarajan does not monitor or use Appellants' claimed historical data. Also, the monitored, stored and analyzed event data of Natarajan is not used for *configuring a video conferencing network*. Instead, the data is used to assess the viability of a current frame relay CIR policy. Nothing in Natarajan discusses configuring or reconfiguring a video conferencing network based on the event data.


---

<sup>15</sup> Natarajan, column 31, lines 33-57.

Accordingly, in view of the present amendment and in light of the previous discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request an early and favorable action to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 03/06)  
MM/rac

Michael E. Monaco  
Registration No. 52,041

I:\ATTY\MM\263550US-AM1.doc